1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8		DISTRICT COURT CT OF CALIFORNIA
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	THAT ONE VIDEO ENTERTAINMENT, LLC, a California limited liability company, Plaintiff, v. KOIL CONTENT CREATION PTY LTD., an Australian proprietary limited company doing business as NOPIXEL; MITCHELL CLOUT, an individual; and DOES 1-25, inclusive, Defendants.	Case No. 2:23-CV-02687 SVW (JCx) [Assigned to the Hon. Stephen V. Wilson; Ctrm 10A] DEFENDANTS REPLY BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT Hearing Date: October 21, 2024 Time: 1:30 p.m. Dept.: Courtroom 10A (10th Floor) 350 W. First Street Los Angeles, CA 90012 Judge: Hon. Stephen V. Wilson

27

28

On September 23, 2024, Defendants filed the instant Motion for Summary Judgment. Per court rules, Plaintiff's opposition brief was due to be filed no later than September 30, 2024 (21 days prior to the October 21, 2024 hearing date). Plaintiff did not file any opposition brief to Defendants' Motion. Accordingly, Defendants' request that the court enter summary judgment in Defendants' favor as there are no issues in dispute.

FRCP 56(e) states, in pertinent part, "If a party fails to properly support an assertion of fact or fails to properly address another party's assertion of fact as required by Rule 56(c), the court may:

... (2) consider the fact undisputed for purposes of the motion; [or]
(3) grant summary judgment if the motion and supporting materials—including the facts considered undisputed—show that the movant is entitled to it; ..."

CD CA Rule 56-3 states, "In determining any motion for summary judgment or partial summary judgment, the Court may assume that the material facts as claimed and adequately supported by the moving party are admitted to exist without controversy except to the extent that such material facts are (a) included in the "Statement of Genuine Disputes" and (b) controverted by declaration or other written evidence filed in opposition to the motion."

In the present case, Plaintiff has not presented any evidence to controvert the (now) undisputed facts that, *inter alia*, (1) Daniel Tracey granted Koil a license to incorporate his code into the NoPixel server, (2) there was never an agreement to "loan-out" Mr. Tracey's services to Koil, and (3) the code that Mr. Tracey contributed to the NoPixel server was not a joint work and thus neither Mr. Tracey nor Plaintiff can be considered to be a joint author of the NoPixel server.

1	In light of these undisputed facts, Defendants' respectfully request that the	
2	Court grant the motion and enter summary judgment in favor of Defendants.	
3	D. 4 7777	
4	DATED: October 3, 2024	
5		MORRISON COOPER
6		By: /s/Larry Zerner Larry Zerner Attorney for KOIL
7		CONTENT CREATION PTY LTD.
8		AND MITCHELL CLOUT
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		